THE STATE OR THE MARKET? AN EVALUATION OF PRIVATE SECURITY PATROL IN PUBLIC RESIDENTIAL AREAS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM

Michael McManus

Copyright © 2024 Michael McManus

All rights reserved.

ISBN: 9798879574456

FOR ANNETTE

.

CONTENTS

	Acknowledgments	i
1	Introduction	1
2	Methodology	7
3	The Theory of Collective Security and State-Centered Governance	11
4	State Policing as a Public Good	28
5	The Eight Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security Defined	36
6	The Case Studies	41
7	Conclusions	58
	Bibliography	65
	Index	79
	About the Author	83

Tables

1	Case Study 1. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security	43
2	Case Study 2. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security	45
3	Case Study 3. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security	48
4	Case Study 4. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security	50
5	Case Study 5. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security	53
6	Case Study 6. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security	56
7	Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security of Six Case Studies	57

1 INTRODUCTION

The problem of social justice and democracy in security provision is at the heart of a theoretical impasse in security governance studies between opposing state-centered and market-centered theorist. The anxiety of how, in a market economy, private forms of governance can ensure the equitable provision of security as a 'collective good' is distinctively troublesome to settle. The research outlined in this book usefully contributes to the debate through the analysis of six case studies of a well-defined type of plural security provision, namely, private security patrol in public residential areas of the United Kingdom. Essentially, I assess here Loader and Walker's precise prediction that private forms of security governance are unlikely to provide equitable

security.

Over the last four decades, the pluralisation of security provision in the United Kingdom has produced an historic re-ordering which assigned it from little more than 'fate', in the sense of purely public provision through the state police, to a broader 'choice' in which a variety of non-state providers became available (Jones and Newburn, 2006; Jones, and Lister, 2015; McManus, 1995). This new order presently shows no signs of diminishing, and its existence punctuates complex issues which have engendered attempts to resolve one of the most important concerns it has raised in the field of contemporary criminal justice - how pluralistic security provision should be configured for the future.

Responding effectively to this concern is hampered by the fact that academic work is still in its developmental stages in security governance studies. New forms of security provision continue to change the scenery of crime control while calls for new

knowledge to be brought on security governance through robust fieldwork, assessments and reasoned explanations are encouragingly made (Wood, 2006: 217-8; Zedner, 2009: 143-44). Indeed, some of the most respected commentators on security governance have devoted whole sections of their work to inspiring potential research and innovation in the field, challenging researchers to seek fresh explanations through rich modes of enquiry in order to address theoretical and methodological limitations (Wood and Dupont, 2006; Wood, 2006: 240).

Yet, research advances continue to be slow. Almost two decades after Wood and Dupont (ibid.) sought to ease the methodological restraint and countless private watchful agents increase in public places, standing guard to deter potential wrongdoers', rigorous evidence for their effectiveness remains elusive. However, some recent research has shown private patrols in public spaces can reduce victims and deter offenders (Ariel, Bland and Sutherland, 2017). Farrell et al (2011) found that private security generally contributed to crime reduction.

Included in the plethora of research designs evoked is an important call for more ethnographical studies which closely analyse practices (Manning, 2006: 54) and for more local studies of security in order to show that a coherent and universal mentality of governance is extinct (O'Malley, 1996) in favour of local variations in the way that individual actors in the security field exploit and pursue their personal mentalities within institutions and through their practices (Stenson and Edwards, 2004). At the heart of all these writer's evocations is the objective of greater effectiveness in decisions of policy and procedure on how the provision of security is configured. I personally add to these writer's cries an additional need to bring together more effectively the ethnographical research already undertaken on security governance, especially some lesser referenced studies. The present research study contributes to the field of security governance in a small, but significant way, by addressing these research issues and focuses particularly on the theoretical impasse in the core debate.

The scholarly writing on the issue of security governance is generally well-developed theoretically, but theoretical positions have been taken which are profoundly contradictory on how security should be governed. The state-centred side of the competing narratives argues that democratic transformation rests in the development of strong state institutions (Loader and Walker, 2006, 2007; Marks and Goldsmith, 2006; Zedner, 2009) while the other side proposes a more de-centred, private, market agenda (Burris, Drahos and Shearing, 2005; Johnson and Shearing, 2003; Wood and Shearing, 2007; Wood and Dupont, 2006).

At the centre of this academic deadlock is the problem of social justice and democracy in security provision - specifically the concern for how private forms of governance can ensure the equitable provision of security as a 'collective good' in a market economy (Loader and Walker, 2006, 2007). De-centred governance theorists argue that state power in the provision of security has so diminished that all providers (nodes) should now have equal influence

within a nodal network of providers. Their opponents insist that, as security is a 'thick' and un-contestable public good, the state should retain the dominating influence to ensure fairness and equity of provision. Although both sides argue with compelling proofs of their positions this tends to compound the theoretical impasse. In undertaking this research, I crucially recognize that this academic stalemate must not be allowed to rest (Zedner, 2007: 139) and further research to contribute some disentanglement of the issue will reinvigorate the debate and contribute to the field.

2 METHODOLOGY

My research objective was to determine the equitableness of private security patrol in public residential areas in the UK. I define 'equitable' for the purposes of this research as, *implying justice dictated by reason, conscience, and a natural sense of what is fair to all* – in effect, the theory of 'collective security' formulated in the work of Loader and Walker (2006. 2007). For the purposes of this research, I have defined private security patrol in public residential areas as *'privately employed personnel used for security or reconnaissance in those residential places to which the public usually have unrestricted access and are maintained at the public expense and under public control'*. 'Public places', therefore, is closely aligned in this definition to the streets and

neighbourhood areas which have been, historically, the exclusive domain of public police patrol. Accordingly, a clear connection is made to the extent of that contemporary shift to private security patrol which runs parallel to the diminishing public police patrol of the last four decades. The inherent workplace of the public police is of course public space as defined, and the reaction of the police is consequently limited through the distinction between public space and private space. In the former they operate without restriction whereas in the latter they need to obtain special authorization, such as a warrant. When seen from this research perspective it becomes clear how little ethnographic research has been undertaken on this subject area since earlier ethnographic studies, for instance, McManus (1995); Noaks (2000); Sharpe and Wilson (2000), and how a dearth of knowledge on this theme remains. Using a case study design which draws together existing research studies for review and analysis also answers earlier calls for empirical clarity (Wood and Dupont, 2006; Wood, 2006: 240).

The units of analysis in this research are six case studies of historical research in public residential areas in the UK. The research objective sought to ascertain whether a causal relationship exists between this de-centred form of security and the dependant variable 'inequitable security'. It was critical to the validity of the research that a within-case method of causal inference was adopted (Collier, 1993; George and Bennett, 2005: 178-79). This congruence method in case study research allowed the use of the six case studies to develop the existing state-centered theory.

I began with the theory of collective security and state centered governance and assessed its ability to explain or predict an outcome in each case. If the analysis is consistent with the theory's prediction a possible causal relationship may exist (George and Bennett, 2005: 181). Extrapolating: from close observation of the pre-existing theory, I identified the dependent variable as 'inequitable security' and that the pre-existing theory predicted precisely that de-centered, private forms of governance are unlikely to provide 'collective/equitable security'. From further careful

analysis of the pre-existing theory its constituent attributes, or independent variables, were developed into the contextual framework of explanatory typologies to be analysed (Elman, 2009: 122). The observed value of the dependent variable was then compared with the individual value of each independent variable in the contextual framework to ascertain what independent variables each case demonstrated in the data analysis. Along the dimension of the attributes High, Medium, Low, I subjectively applied an ordinal measurement to describe each of the eight variables. Accordingly, using the six case studies, the consistency of the pre-existing theory's prediction was tested for the possibility of a causal relationship between private security patrol in public residential areas and 'inequitable security'.

3 THE THEORY OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND STATE-CENTERED GOVERNANCE

In their theory of 'collective security' Loader and Walker (2001; 2006; 2007) predict precisely that private forms of governance are unlikely to provide 'equitable security' and, accordingly, argue for state-centered, 'collective security' governance in order to mitigate private security's inequitable effects. To achieve this, they observe the need for a reconstruction of the concept of security as it currently exists in neo-liberal thinking; their key assertion being that values of social inclusion and freedom are central to the role of security. Their analysis is based upon three key conceptions, namely,

security as a 'thick' public good, neo-liberal security as paradoxical and state policing as a public good. Security, therefore, is to be understood not as a less worthy public good of a 'thinner' technical and economic nature, such as the domestic services we *singly* receive from councils and public utilities, but in the higher sense of security's worth based on values of mutual concern for others, social interaction, trust, and commitment to the collective good within a bonded community. Accordingly, this state-centred and virtuous model of security is not only equitable and fair but socially and culturally transformative of 'community' itself (Loader and Walker, 2006: 191-192).

I now consider these three dimensions from the perspective of my research methodology and ultimately develop the constituent attributes of the theory into a typology of concepts. These concepts will comprise the independent variables to be tested against the nature and characteristics of the case studies.

Security as a 'thick' public good

The instrumental dimension of Loader and Walker's formulation of security is essentially a pre-requisite of freedom and the criterion from which a democratic and free society progresses (ibid: 184-85). It cannot, therefore, be limited to a selected few in society who may pay the provider a fee because the exclusion of others alters its dimension as a public good by ceasing to be everyone's right of provision (2007: 146-7). It naturally follows from this that exclusionary aspects of security cannot be classed as a public good because equitable security provision is characteristically a 'non-rival' good which avoids harmful exposure to other community members, constraining their liberty (ibid: 147-8) for instance, displacement of crime from well secured to less secured areas in the vicinity, discovered by some research (McManus, 1995).

This instrumental dimension of moral security is, nevertheless, linked to a purely economic view of provision which is, on its own, an inadequate representation of the 'thick' public good which the authors, Loader and Walker (ibid.) foresee. In seeking

the meaning of the term 'thick' in sociological rather than economic terms the authors (2001: 25, ibid.) espouse Waldron's view that the worth of a public good is valuable for the whole of society and not merely for individual members (Waldron, 1993: 358-9).

In following Waldron the authors are arguing that an individual's security crucially depends upon the security of others: a social dimension crucially dependent not instrumentally of its value to a single member of society but to all its members together. There are two affiliated dimensions which the authors identify within this social dimension. The first is an inter-subjective condition between the crime prevention efforts of an individual and the efforts of another to threaten them – both individuals crucially depend upon the actions and attitudes of the other (Loader and Walker, 2006: 185). Secondly, how these inter-subjective measures are subjectively interpreted and experienced also impact on the individual's sense of security and trust - in effect the extent of the individual's level of anxiety (ibid). However, anxiety-

free security is a controversial issue - its achievement is uncertain due to various uncontrollable conditions the nature of which are complex. This complexity is exemplified in the authors' reference to the paradoxical nature of neoliberal security provision seen in the work of Birki (ibid) and Zedner (2003).

Neoliberal security provision in this view does not exist in an environment of equivalent-vulnerability in relation to individuals. Such paradoxical and difficult circumstances alert us to the limitations of the social dimension of security which, the authors claim, do not allow sufficiently for socially strong mutual dependence (ibid: 2007: 186-7). Their answer is to allow in a constitutive element of security which relates to how the value of security as a social or collective good is involved in defining 'the social' and 'the public'. Here the authors want to express how the social or collective good is concerned in the performance of constituting how security is profoundly involved in the identity of the 'social' and the 'public' (2006:184-189).

The instrumental, social, and constitutive properties of security outlined hang together as an interrelated and harmonious whole. For the authors, it is inconceivable that the instrumental dimension of security can be realized without attention to the social and constitutive in order to realize its 'collective' properties. Indeed, their concept and meaning of collective security is implicated in the development of community as an ideal which they claim can assist in 'a virtuous cycle of crime control' (ibid: 191-192). Accordingly, security's foundational role in Loader and Walker's re-construction of security as a 'thick' public good is ultimately the constitution of liberty - the most important such instrumental purpose.

Loader and Walker, thus, want to present security as an irreducibly social achievement and insecurity as an irreducibly social failure - a collective bad, inherently threatening to individual freedom and social diversity. Freedom, through the lowering of the position of the individual and the promotion of the community is, accordingly, at the forefront of their perspective.

Neo-liberal security as paradoxical

For both Berki (ibid) and Zedner (2009) the problem of security and the problem of freedom are equivalent - sought everywhere yet paradoxically unobtainable. Following Berki and Zedner, Loader and Walker contradict the views of those who promote neo-liberal security as an unequivocal good and argue it is the antithesis to their perspective (2007: Chapter 1). In following the notion of security as a 'thick', rather than a 'thin' public good representative of personal freedom and democracy, Loader and Walker charge the neo-liberal security lobby with complicity in the injurious aspects of security by passively accepting the social costs to freedom. The authors, therefore, align their theory of collective security inescapably with criticism of these paradoxes and the profound problems they create for security defined as a public good.

Zedner (2003b) has provided specific paradoxical descriptions of the social cost of security and for Berki's earlier exposition (ibid) there is in these an overarching paradox in the hopeless expectation of

security as unobtainable. For Loader and Walker, the most profound problem created by the neoliberal security lobby is their inability to address this paradox and recognize that the state concurrently provides a guarantee for our security yet, through its expansion and policies, threatens it. Berki (ibid) sees this problem as partly the fault of the temporal phase-shift to neoliberalism from what Zedner has called the 'post crime' society to the 'pre-crime' society, where crime prevention has become the primary strategic policy for the governance of crime while, at the same time, the moral dimension of 'punishment' as policy has slipped away into the background of the criminal justice system (Zedner, 2007).

In contemporary society the vague and unpleasant feelings of anxiety, risk, worry, nervousness, and unease we experience daily about our safety have become pervasive and institutionalised as normal experiences (Felson, 2002). For Loader and Walker insecurity-anxiety does not make good democratic citizens and results in communities becoming the very antithesis of the good society they seek to give

description to (ibid: 8). In arguing the pervasive and reflexive presence of risk and anxiety the authors are alluding to the everyday crime prevention commodities of personal security, such as house and car alarms, that surround our routines and environment, and which can become a constant reminder to the individual of their insecurity. Searching for resolutions exclusively through these accoutrements of security, they argue, may increase fear, anxiety, and differences between local communities rather than bring them together (ibid: 12).

Security for the authors, thus, becomes an ontological problem in that seeking the continuity and certainty of security in our lives we experience what Birki (ibid: 31-33) calls our 'differentiated self' – as individuals we are construed all the same, yet we are all different. This makes us at one and the same time the answer to our own insecurity yet the cause of insecurity in others. Importantly, the problem as Birki sees it is that the 'differentiated self' is political, and our moral character is so profoundly influenced that at every

stage of our quest for security we are surrounded by politics and our actions respond naturally to it (ibid: 37).

The 'differentiated self' is, thus, implicated in the enduring nature and characteristics of crime and disorder, for while crime is accepted as a normal element of contemporary society, paradoxically, security nevertheless seeks the diminution of risk. This is compounded through the influence of the economic analysis of crime; opportunity reduction, which has become embedded in the mind-set of individuals and now sees crime not as a moral wrong but as a favourable combination of circumstances and, - 'a routine activity' or 'opportunity' (Clarke, 1995), a 'fact of everyday life,' (Felson, ibid) which requires compelling and immediate action to prevent it. The influence of crime prevention as a strategy brings with it the 'pre-crime society' (Zedner, 2007) where the individualism of material loss takes the place of a more collective security based upon moral excellence and shared values of the kind sought by Loader and Walker's alternative conception of what

security should be.

The 'everyday' nature of crime as we encounter it and the associated pervasiveness of risk and anxiety are perpetuated through the criminal justice system and the media by constantly 'educating' the population in crime information and prevention and, accordingly, anxiety begets anxiety. The social solidarity of communities, so important in Loader and Walker's conception of collective security, is absent in this reflexive account as it discourages ordinary social activities, especially in the vulnerable, who are constantly reluctant to venture out. And fewer people about will decrease security as those who seek to commit crime see better opportunities. This leads on to the notion of security's exclusionary characteristics.

Amongst strangers, in the normal course of daily social interaction we have little knowledge of who is friend or foe. Although, outwardly, our physical appearances are similar and we can shape our thoughts on strangers accordingly, we have no such sense of the inner being's intentions. We have here

for Birki, (ibid: 11) another dilemma of trust in that we are all the same yet different by an inability to trust intentions. In drawing our attention through this paradox to the notion of a society of strangers unable to trust each other, Berki recognizes the exclusionary effects of contemporary security provision which Loader and Walker see as a loss to the inclusionary benefits of collective security (Loader and Walker, 2001: 27). Paradoxically, security asserted as it is by the security lobby as an indisputable universal good, is in fact exclusionary in itself because it is based upon a warning that something unpleasant is immanent and its urgent request is to identify, target, and exclude risky social categories and populations (Zedner, 2003b: 12).

For Loader and Walker, the over-emphasis, and sometimes exaggeration of the assessment of risk, increasingly drives social exclusion and brings with it the motivation for inequity by commercial agencies whose primary objective is economic profit. As security-seekers turn to collective action of the characteristically 'thinner' and exclusionary category,

community characteristics become ones of self-interest and insularity (Crawford, 2006) and the antithesis of Loader and Walker's conception of the good community. Their argument for good security recognizes 'freedom' and, as Birki argues, in our quest for perfect security our isolation within the gated communities we create makes us precisely 'unfree' (Birki, ibid: 22-23) while those outside become strangers. This social state requires us to recognize the paradoxical 'differentiated self' (Birki, ibid: 29-31). Security thus becomes the implicit problem of social existence as it specifies us as identical and yet different, separate, and disunited because of our common identity.

The element of trust is crucial to communities of collective security and attachment according to Loader and Walker. That security is considered a 'thick' public good assumes the paradox that the pursuit of security as a 'thin' public good is mostly unfavourable to the good of community and society. Security, based as it is upon rational choice theory where crime is our selfish and rational response to

opportunity and temptation, makes security's trump card the cost of deviance-discovery. Consequently, trust is weakened, worn down or destroyed altogether as security puts us all on the far side of trust (Zedner, 2003a:15). The demise of trust as a foundation of community and society (Giddens, 1991a) means that systems and strategies of crime prevention have grown and, accordingly, we have limited the stranger's ability to do us harm. As a consequence, we signal and compound our lack of trust in others and this impoverishes social relations, producing a society of strangers (Suttles, 1972).

Following Loader and Walker, the mutual exclusiveness of public and private provision has a deep significance to security as community detachment, much like that propounded by Zedner, (2003a:162-163). Accordingly, security requires that the positive aspects of communities of attachment and trust fosters a relation of mutual dependence, action, and influence as necessary dimensions of an ethically bonded community conducive to the 'thicker' public good. The writers note that three

security-related intentions proceed from this. First, they claim, it sustains a sense of national political community or civic nationalism and welfare-oriented thought of the kind which is the antithesis of an exclusionary mentality. Second, civic nationalism is conducive to consensus policing and, therefore, a more virtuous circle of the control of crime and disorder will ensue where resources are directed effectively and public confidence in the police steps up. Third, the virtuous circle is strengthened as the authority of a political community of civic nationalism and inclusionary communities of attachment are increasingly braced-up and lent moral support by state institutions such as the police.

While the prospect of security may promise freedom from crime and disorder, security has the capacity to damage our freedom and civil liberties. In the risk-laden world in which we move we accept, to some degree, the loss of some civil liberties when security staff and technology make various checks to ascertain our risky-ness. By being in particularly risk groups some people pose an increased threat to a place –

women travelling, for instance, are highly suspect in that they are able to secrete items more successfully. Ethnic minorities of Middle Eastern appearance are also of greater interest to security staff at places such as airports. These suspensions of democratic freedom may be justified in the name of personal safety of us all but the use of security measures like these have broadened into ordinary day to day life. Yet, it is noted that general acceptance of searches in the name of security at innocuous places, such as entertainment venues, and of the less risky individuals who attend them, has developed without any debate about infringement of our rights (Zedner, 2003b). Additionally, camera surveillance is now in every conceivable place we might visit and which, claims Zedner (ibid) is more times than not seeking out deviant behaviour unconnected with terrorism, is invasive and can affect our privacy and freedom on a daily basis.

Birki (ibid: 13-14) asserts that the state is now seen as ineffective in combatting crime and disorder yet is at the same time viewed increasingly as threatening,

interfering and powerful. The paradox here refers to the various government strategies and philosophies approved without criticism by the security lobby, such as partnership approaches and self-help, which widen a security net into which more are likely to fall (Cohen, 1985). With regard to private security, it could be imagined, therefore, that state sovereignty and drive are replaced by private influence, yet it is quite easy to see how state influence is extended through the use of private agencies – the partnership approach to crime and disorder (Giddens, 1971, 1987, Giddens, Beck and Lash 1994; McManus, 2024: 149-169).). Furthermore, such strategies subject the 'partners' in 'the police family' (Crawford, 2013) to state accountability, for instance, through the processes of funding which extends state control over what might otherwise be essentially private or voluntary crime control enterprises.

4 STATE POLICING AS A PUBLIC GOOD

Loader and Walker (2001: 28; 2007: Chapter 7) argue that public policing is itself a public good capable of providing collective security of the 'thicker' and inclusionary type that can develop better within a state-centred security environment. This is because the authors see the state as best placed to identify the security landscape and inequity while acting as arbitrator and coordinator to maximize ultimate effect (Loader and Walker, 2001: 26-9). As alluded to earlier, their reasoning here rests on *constitutive* and reinforcing social dimensions of state-centred security as, '…a complex of virtues' (ibid:28) 27-9) and the authors formulate four mutually cooperative and virtuous dimensions, namely, *coercive, logistical, economic, and cultural*, constructs which they claim are imperative

to equity and democratic liberty (ibid. 27-9). These are exclusively and essentially characteristics of state provision in which the public police have the necessary means to apply legitimate force, coordinate governance of plural policing, undertake collective provision and maintain communities of attachment. For the authors, it is these mutually constitutive and reinforcing social dimensions, characteristic of the public police role, which hold the solitary promise of plural security provision as a 'collective' public good. The focus now turns to these four dimensions of policing as an irreducible public good.

The coercive dimension recognizes that the police do not have the monopoly of the legitimate use of force - various non-police institutions have conditional authority to use *limited* force in certain circumstances. The police use of force, however, is unlimited in its scope as long as it is reasonable, and Loader and Walker remind us that this fundamental right to use coercive force still rests only within the state and not with non-state agents (2007: 188-89). It is this sole right to use legitimate, coercive, non-negotiable force

which a police officer uses reasonably in carrying out his lawful duty and on which the basis of public policing is founded (Bittner, 1985:23). It follows for Loader and Walker, therefore, to restrict and confine non-negotiable force to the police alone so that they can ensure equitable distributional justice, is characteristically a public good and a vital component of security (2001: 27; 2004 :225; 2007: 188-92). Furthermore, the civilising qualities which spring from police sole performance of non-negotiable force has additional benefits for collective security because it allows the public to feel confident in the right of the police to use coercive force (2007: 192). So, importantly for the authors, the confidence of people to expect the police to use their powers reasonably strengthens the benefits of state coordination. It follows, therefore, that the extent to which this right and function is arrogated by non-state actors, such as private security, is a menacing indication that the public good of security is being challenged.

The logistical dimension sees the importance of what the authors term 'deliberation' in state-centred

provision. By this they mean how calculated decisions on security provision, based on evidence and rational thinking, can be fully exploited through the police who have the necessary wherewithal for this work (ibid: 185). Accordingly, common understanding of the 'thick' public good of a security decision between different agencies providing and receiving security of the 'thick' public good kind is a crucial factor in the attainment of collective security and it follows that the deliberation ensuing from such an inclusive framework is best centred in the state (ibid: 187-8).

Furthermore, state coordination of resources, when directed effectively, enhances public confidence in the police and, when coordinated governance is extended through the police to plural security as outlined above, the certainty of equity of provision is further assured. This is possible through logistical effectiveness in reflexively coordinating and demanding democratic accountability from the plural inter-organizational networks (nodes). For instance, crime intelligence collation and communication is a primary responsibility of the state and only the public

police have the means to ensure effectiveness.

From an economic dimension, a central role of the state is the taxing of the population and Loader and Walker identify the provision of security as one justification for taxation and as fortifying collective security (ibid: 182-3). The unstable nature of the private state, which can be exemplified in the fluidity of private agents and security companies, they claim, is no substitution for a steady public one (ibid: 185).

Loader and Walker's cultural dimension relates to their argument that state-centred coordination of plural security already brings with it cultural identification. This is possible through the state's identification-work of imaginative construction which has the capacity to provide cultural and ordering tasks which are indispensable for collective security (ibid: 176). This homogeneous relationship between the police, the state and the nation exists in cultural spaces to which the police have prior social recognition and influence (Loader and Mulcahy 2003: 323), albeit to varying degrees of social acceptance.

Loader and Walker consider the political imagery that the state shapes and crucially identify '…a generic politics dedicated to the identification and delivery of public goods and the protection of a private sphere from excessive meddling' (2007: 181). Loader (1997:152) argues that private security patrols may lack both sufficient elements of protection to meet public demand and the symbolic power which the public police possess. Crucially, for them, this places the state as the primary location and strongest influence for political identity and community. Their revised conception places the coordinated rendering of these values within the state, which, they argue, already holds the moral and ethical template for provision (Loader and Walker, 2006:8) – security equally provided for all people together, not singly, one by one (Loader and Walker, 2001: 25-29; 2006: 183).

Based on the foregoing analysis, for Loader and Walker the two most central and valued roles of collective security are disclosed as freedom and social inclusion. Like Berki and Zedner, they view the

equivalence of security, freedom, and social inclusion as essential to their perspective and, thus, these three entities are conceptually one and the same and interdependent. It follows from this that existing singly they are each states of imperfection. These imperfections can be observed in the eight opposing dimensions of collective security revealed in the foregoing analysis:

1. Social exclusion
2. Subjective anxiety
3. Risk communities
4. Personal mistrust
5. Harm
6. Intrusive surveillance
7. State incoordination
8. Illegal force

These overall opposing dimensions of collective security, thus, becomes *restraint of freedom*. The values of social inclusion and freedom and their association with these opposing characteristics of collective security have been well made elsewhere: restraint

(Zedner, 2009) anxiety (Buckner et al, 2010; Baumeister and Tice, 1990); risk (O'Malley, 1986); mistrust (Lau and Ridge, 2011); harm, displacement of crime (Guerette, and Bowers, 2009); surveillance (Byrne, 2005; Flint, 2006); state coordination and illegal force (Broduer, 2010). In the following chapter, the eight opposing dimensions, observed in our discussion so far, are summarized and defined for clarity.

5 THE EIGHT OPPOSING DIMENSIONS OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY DEFINED.

Social Exclusion. Security may be seen by some as a universal good, however, it is based upon threats and its quest entails identifying, targeting, and excluding those members of society seen as risky and threatening. Furthermore, the over-emphasis and sometimes exaggeration of the assessment of risk increasing drives exclusion (Zedner, 2003b: 12).

Subjective Anxiety. The normality and everyday nature of crime ensures that security agents and media will constantly be educating the population in crime prevention. Anxiety engenders anxiety. The constant publicising of insecurity and risks reminds citizens of crime and disorder and increases subjective insecurity

(Zedner, 2003b: 8). This reflexive process of self can lead to insecurity, anxiety, and a greater sense of vulnerability.

Risk Communities. Neoliberal security has a pervasive and reflexive presence. It is reflected in risk communities which respond enthusiastically to neoliberal strategies of crime control – risk as politics. Such communities are sensitive to their insecurity, fear crime and respond with high profile crime prevention strategies which can result in fragmented residential areas (O'Malley, 1992, 1998).

Personal Mistrust. Neoliberal security is founded upon rational choice theory – a rational response to opportunity where self-interest is presumed to drive everyone. Personal mistrust in communities engenders security to compensate for the demise of trust but distrust increases further. Self-interest is inimical to trust (Zedner, 2003b:171).

Harm. Effective situational crime prevention implies potential harm to the less well protected. This is not

conducive to other's happiness (Mill, 1869). Crime displacement, although difficult to prove, exemplifies this element of harm. The rival nature of neoliberal security is driven by the known effectiveness of situational crime prevention (Clarke, 1997, 2012) theoretically based on rational choice and routine activity. Both potential victims and offenders seek advantage for themselves. In particular, routine activity theory (Felson) argues that criminal events stem from the conjunction of offender, target, and absence of a capable guardian. Effective situational crime prevention requires changing the last two of these. Private security agents are, thus, potentially effective, and capable guardians in hardening targets against criminality.

Intrusive Surveillance. The extent to which security may intrude and penetrate the confidentiality of our daily lives is an issue of human rights, civil liberties and ultimately freedom. Surveillance, thus, requires sensitivity to its intrusiveness by operatives. This sensitivity becomes a crucial element of freedom.

State Incoordination. Loader and Walker (ibid:28) 27-9) trace four mutually cooperative and virtuous elements of public police provision - coercive, logistical, economic, and cultural dimensions - which they claim are imperative to principles of equity and democratic liberty. It follows from this that the level of cooperation and coordination between the public police and other plural security providers will impact on these principles and the public good of security.

Illegal force. To restrict and confine non-negotiable force to the public police alone, so that they can ensure equitable distributional justice, is characteristically an existing public good and a vital component of equitable security (Loader and Walker, 2001: 27; 2004:225; 2007: 188-92). The confidence of people to expect the police to use their powers reasonably strengthens the benefits of state coordination of security. The extent to which this right and function is used by private security agents is a menacing indication that the public good of security is being challenged.

In the next section the individual case studies will be described in relation to the eight opposing dimensions of collective security. Whereas some opposing dimensions - social exclusion, harm, surveillance, illegal force, and state incoordination - are relatively straightforward to determine in the case studies, anxiety, mistrust, and risk elements are psychologically based in nature and involve identifying the more reflexive processes extant. This makes them difficult to identify in the resident population of the patrolled areas. Anxiety, mistrust and risk reduction, or gain, as a result of the patrol is important to identify. I recognize here, accordingly, a need to be sensitive to this in the analysis of each case.

6 THE CASE STUDIES

Case Study One

At Washington, Tyne and Wear, McManus (1995) studied part of a large urban conurbation in the North East of England suffering high crime and disorder problems. Operating from the owner's nearby corporation-owned house, the private security company employed five mobile dog patrol guards who patrolled the surrounding industrial estates and thirty-one subscribing privately owned residential properties. The residential units and surroundings were tidy and contrasted in appearance with the area's drabber corporation-owned housing; separated by a high wooden fence at the rear of the street. Fifty yards from the patrolled street was an identical,

unpatrolled street which became very relevant to a comparative data analysis with the patrolled street. Prior to 1988 the residents had experienced very little crime in their neighbourhood but in that year, there was an increase in crime in their area of over fifty per cent on the 1987 figure. A survey showed that twenty-seven per cent of the subscribers to the patrol experienced security-anxiety. In addition to burglaries and thefts, minor street nuisances were occurring which were especially problematic to particular residents. Subjective anxiety was, therefore, measured as medium. A high personal mistrust of strangers existed. There was no effective Neighbourhood Watch scheme and there was a general feeling by residents that police were now powerless to resolve their crime and disorder problems. Residents' perception of police as an impotent agency led them to consider what other measures could be implemented to prevent crime and hiring a private patrol was a consensus decision on behalf of residents in the street. They telephoned the private security company after seeing an advertisement in a local newspaper offering patrol services. The residents felt

assured by the patrol and incidents of crime and disorder did reduce. There was no evidence of intrusive surveillance as a result of the patrol nor was there any evidence of security-harm taking place.

There was no formal arrangement for liaison between the local police and the private patrol, but informal contact did exist. A survey of local police officers found that the majority thought the informal cooperation was 'average' - about half had come in contact with the private patrol up to five times in the previous twelve months and that half had no contact whatsoever. There was no evidence of illegal force being used by the private patrol.

Table 1.

Case Study One. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security

Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Incoordination*	*Illegal Force*
Medium	Medium	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low

Case study Two

Sharp and Wilson (2000) studied private security patrol on a housing estate in Doncaster, South

Yorkshire. The owner of the security company was a local resident who had worked as a doorman and had a history of violent crime, street fighting and boxing – but he had reformed and became a born-again Christian. In 1993 he began the private patrol after local residents became weary of a constant crime and disorder problem in the area. By 1996 there were 3,000 subscribers each paying one pound per week.

Between 1987 and 1981 reported crime had increased by thirty-seven per cent while various categories of crime in the town and surrounding area had increased between fifty and eighty percent with a fifty-two per cent increase in house burglary. The residents were weary of the constant crime problem, strangers were mistrusted, and the private company exploited the insecurity felt. In a survey carried out of subscribers none reported being a victim of burglary or other serious crime but described experiencing nuisance parking in the streets at night. This led the researchers to reason that the fear of crime, rather than experiences of crime itself, led to feelings of insecurity. There was strong evidence from subscriber

interviews that the patrol provided assurance. There was no evidence of security-harm, intrusive surveillance, or illegal force as a result of the patrol.

The relationship between the patrol and the local police was uncooperative. There was a lot of evidence that the police distrusted the patrol. The patrol claimed that the local police were harassing the patrollers and officially complained. There was no evidence of unlawful force being used. There were verbal statements made by some subscribers that the local police were less proactive than the patrol. The patrollers were seen by some subscribers as tough and less constrained in their interventions than the police.

Table 2.

Case Study Two. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security

Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Incoordination*	*Illegal Force*
Medium	High	High	Medium	Low	Low	High	Low

Case Study Three

At Ouston, County Durham, McManus (1995) studied a privately patrolled area in a large, newly built

residential estate in a rural setting situated on the outskirts of a large town. To the north and east of the estate was open countryside and within a distance of five miles was a large urban conurbation. The estate consisted of approximately 1,000 privately owned houses, bungalows, and flats. The estate had both patrolled and un-patrolled areas which were conveniently divided by a road - a factor which assisted the legitimacy of a comparative crime pattern analysis.

The private estate was bounded on two sides by council-owned housing and boundaries were well defined by large stretches of shrub-land. The private estate's economic separateness from the council-owned area was visually apparent. In 1986 a spate of offences to property occurred over a continuous two-month period and the police were unable to arrest the persons responsible. The residents lost confidence in the effectiveness of the police when a spate of daytime burglaries began to occur regularly without anyone being arrested or prevention strategies being taken by the police. Additionally, most residents

expressed anxiety for continuing increases in local disorder and the fear of personal victimization. The mistrust of strangers was high. Some of the residents turned to a local private security guard, who had effectively protected the estate when it was being built contracting his services as a preventative patrol. After canvassing residents, the patrolman had obtained approximately 200 subscribers. He made a charge of £1.00 per household per week for his service. He wore a uniform he bought in an army surplus store and patrolled the state daily, either on foot with his Alsatian dog or in an estate-car. It subsequently became apparent from official crime records that the crime rate on the patrolled area of the estate was disproportionately low to the rate on the area un-patrolled and there was evidence of displacement of burglary and car theft – security-harm. There was no complaint of intrusive surveillance by the patrol.

Amongst both residents and local police, the patrolman had a high reputation as a deterrent. Although there was no written policy the patrolman liaised with the local police regularly on crime

intelligence and directed his patrol accordingly. The level of trust and respect in the relationship between the police and the patrolman was very evident. There was no evidence that the patrolman had ever used illegal force.

Table 3.

Case Study Three. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security

Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Incoordination*	*Illegal Force*
Medium	High	High	High	High	Low	Medium	Low

Case Study Four

Noakes (2000) carried out a study of private patrol in the 1990s on both public and privately owned housing units on the outskirts of London. Five private security guards patrolled on foot and in vans between 11pm to 6am daily at a charge of £2 per unit per week.

Prior to the patrol, the community had experienced high levels of crime and disorder and consequent security-anxiety and mistrust of strangers. Although a few of the patrolled units were not privately owned,

most were. A busy road clearly demarcated the public and private areas and the physical contrast between the two was obvious.

A community survey carried out found that ninety-two per cent of subscribers to the service were either satisfied or very satisfied with all aspects of the patrol. Seventy-four per cent of the subscribers to the patrol saw its priority as crime prevention through surveillance and the enhanced physical presence on the streets of the patrollers. Forty-five per cent said their reason for subscribing was to improve the level of security and assurance which the local police had not provided and there was evidence that both subscribers' and non-subscribers' anxiety was reduced by the patrol. Instant response and access to a patrolman was seen by subscribers as one of the most important attributes of the patrol. In terms of social solidarity, the subscribers saw the patrollers as catalysts by their intercommunication with residents and as a source of local knowledge. Once a week the patrollers visited subscribers for payment and gave

out a newsletter. The director of the patrol was a local resident and recognizable in the community. Security-incoordination was evident. Limited communication existed between the police and the private patrol and no formal acknowledgement by the police of the private patrol existed as the police were afraid of affiliating to what they saw as a possibly mismanaged or even corrupt group. There was evidence that a majority of residents did not want private patrols replacing public police patrols but favoured better relationships which would add value to crime prevention. The patrollers stated their primary role was prevention and not arrest or the use force to any degree and no evidence was found to the contrary.

Table 4.

Case Study Four. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security

Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Incoordination*	*Illegal Force*
Medium	High	High	Medium	Low	Low	High	Low

Case Study Five

At Bromley, Kent, McManus (1995) investigated private security patrol comprising an area of sixty square miles with a population of approximately 29,300. Seventy-five per cent of housing was owner-occupied. A progressive shift in council management style had occurred in response to economic pressures over recent decades. In the 1980s and 1990s this shift was specifically spelled out by the council as a move to free market principles and a policy which espoused government ideology of effectiveness and efficiency. The police and caretakers were not keeping the estates safe and there was a lot of vandalism, theft, and burglary. The principal officer in charge of the council research department saw the reasoning for private security as relating mainly to the increasing problems of crime and disorder on estates and the inability of the police to affect any change in that situation. The police said they were unable to help with minor matters such as loitering by gangs. The council had to show that something was being done. On behalf of the residents, the resident's association

suggested to the council that private security patrol was a way of resolving problems.

The private patrol consisted of contract security personnel using four double-crewed vans, patrolling the whole borough area daily from 6pm. to 1am. The private patrol consisted of four double-crewed vans. The research centred on one estate in the south east of the borough which comprised of approximately 1050 housing units. Types of dwelling varied and included blocks of flats, semi-detached houses, and bungalows. There was a strikingly visible contrast between the flats and other housing in the area. Whereas houses and bungalows gave the appearance of environmental normality the blocks of flats were typically untidy in appearance. Inside the flats was the smell of stale urine from the lift-wells and staircases. Graffiti covered both inside and outside walls. Most of the residents were non-owner-occupiers and young persons with families. The cooperation between the police and the private security patrol was good. There were regular council meetings which included the private security personnel and the police and police

and community forums which addressed issues of crime and disorder. There was no evidence of unlawful force being used by the private patrollers.

Currently, the borough council no longer employ private security patrols for housing estates because they do not own any housing stock, having sold it to several different housing associations.

Table 5.

Case Study Five. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security

Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Coordination*	*Illegal Force*
Low	High	High	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Low

Case Study Six

Jacobson and Saville (1999) reported on a private security patrol in Southwark, London. The patrol was introduced in 1994 and covered over 2,200 properties on a specific housing estate. It was later extended to cover the whole of the neighbourhood of 4,515 properties.

Security anxiety was high. The patrol was created in response to fear of crime and high levels of anti-social behaviour, graffiti, general crime, and drug nuisance in an area with serious problems of crime, much of which was drug related. Mistrust of strangers in the area was high. The scheme formed part of a wide range of initiatives being implemented and aimed to support and complement the Metropolitan Police.

The contract for the security patrols was put out to tender on an annual basis. The service provided one supervisor and six patrollers who worked in shifts over a twenty-four-hour period and numbers increased when the risk was greater. The patrollers did not have any special powers and worked in pairs on foot, and carried out letter drops to inform tenants' representatives that they were in the area. They received some training from the police, which covered their common law powers of arrest and restraint techniques. The patrollers made reports of incidents so that appropriate action could be taken against troublesome residents.

A variety of types of minor incident were dealt with such as nuisance caused by children and noise problems. Incidents of graffiti and vandalism were reported to the local authority, which is also notified of empty properties. There was close liaison between the patrollers and the local community police officer both informally and at structured meetings of the resident's association. A newsletter was distributed to keep local people informed of crime prevention matters. The cost of the scheme was £180,000 yearly. Funding was provided by the neighbourhood repairs budget on the grounds that the scheme reduces vandalism and repair costs.

Crime figures for the area indicated a reduction in crime since the start of the patrol. The home beat officer stated that residents are less likely to be the victim of a burglary or robbery in this area than in any other part of the borough. Reported crime on the Aylesbury Estate dropped from approximately 670 incidents in 1997 to 550 incidents in 1998. The local authority was confident that fear of crime had been considerably reduced and this was confirmed by

tenants in informal discussions. It has been suggested that a major factor in the apparent success of the scheme is the familiarity of the patrolling staff with the area, its people, and the home beat officer. (Taken from 'Neighbourhood Warden Schemes: An overview', *Policing and Reducing Crime Unit Crime Reduction Research Series* Paper 2. Home Office).

Table 6.

Case Study Six. Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security

Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Incoordination*	*Illegal Force*
Low	High	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low

Breaking down the existing theory's attributes, or independent variables, I developed them into a contextual framework of explanatory typologies for analysis (Elman, 2009: 122). I then compared the observed value of the dependent variable with the individual value of each independent variable in the contextual framework to see which independent variables each case demonstrated in the data analysis.

In Table 7 I bring together the data from each of the six case studies in a concluding measurement, eliciting

the calculation that if the analysis matches the theory's prediction, there might be a possible cause-and-effect relationship (George and Bennett, 2005: 181) regarding 'inequitable security'.

Table 7

Measure of Opposing Dimensions of Collective Security of six case studies

	Social Exclusion	*Subjective Anxiety*	*Risk Communities*	*Personal Mistrust*	*Harm*	*Intrusive Surveillance*	*State Incoordination*	Illegal Force
Study One	Medium	Medium	High	High	Low	Low	High	Low
Study Two	Medium	High	High	Medium	Low	Low	High	Low
Study Three	Medium	High	High	High	High	Low	Medium	Low
Study Four	Medium	High	High	Medium	Low	Low	High	Low
Study Five	Low	High	High	Medium	Low	Low	Medium	Low
Study Six	Low	High	High	High	Low	Low	Low	Low

7 CONCLUSION

The findings here show the existence of a causal relationship between private security patrol in public residential areas and the antithesis of Loader and Walker's conception of collective security. The pre-existing theory is supported. When private security allows affluent individuals, as well as those in the middle class, to circumvent state systems, it can exacerbate societal inequalities within a country. Accordingly, to ensure equitable security provision as an un-contestable public good, I argue that the future configuration of plural security governance crucially requires the coordination of the state at its centre.

In contrast to the notion of private forms of security

being inequitable, risk-reducing changes were also evident in these six case studies. Accordingly, private security patrol can indeed have positive preventative effects (Ariel, Bland and Sutherland, 2017). However, lack of communication between the police and private security patrols will detract from the role of the police as 'knowledge brokers' (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997) and prevent them acting effectively as 'co-ordinators' of local knowledge of risk. Ericson and Haggerty {ibid. 73) have also suggested that a community policing input is important in underpinning and providing legitimation for police enforcement roles. These are positive aspects of police and private security cooperation.

Idealism, the philosophical stance emphasizing the significance of ideas, suggests that our beliefs, values, ideals, hopes, and dreams play a crucial role in shaping both society and individual experiences. While the problem of 'idealism' in Loader and Walker's theory is noted, following their view here, it is concluded that to ensure equitable security provision as an incontestable public good of the

'collective' sort, the future configuration of plural security governance crucially requires the coordination of the state at its centre. That is, the coordination of plural security provision through the state police. In this context, Loader and White (2017) have proposed a regulatory model of private security which serves public interest better. This model is similar to that recognised through The European Forum for Urban Security in European states, but such an arrangement is currently not government policy in the UK.

The European Forum for Urban Security (EFUS) is a unique European network focused on promoting dialogue, collaboration, and assistance among local and regional authorities in crime prevention and urban security. Established in 1987, EFUS comprises nearly 250 cities and regions spanning 17 countries. In various European countries like France and Spain, private security interventions in public spaces are generally accepted by the population. During large events, local authorities often engage both municipal police and private security firms for security purposes.

However, the state maintains ultimate authority, as seen in instances where national police collaborate with local authorities and private security during major events. This model is also observed in Spain, where national, municipal, and regional police forces coordinate with private security companies. EFUS promotes the idea plural policing and the cooperation between the police and private security:

> The security of public spaces relies on multiple actors and professions from both the public and the private sector, which all have different professional cultures, operating modes and purposes. This means that co-producing security is not only the logical thing to do but also what needs to be done. As such, it can contribute to strengthening the collective governance of urban security. Strengthening such a security continuum is key for European cities…(Vallar, 2022).

This model, which seems to align with Loader and Walker's notion of plural security governance, with the state at its centre, is not presently a developed response officially in the UK. Furthermore, and negatively, findings of research in the UK suggest challenges ahead in improving policies, procedures, and collaborations between the police and private security patrols, particularly in contexts where traditional policing methods in residential areas

remain predominant (Howell and Gill, 2017).

In a survey of 1361 front line police officers, Howell and Gill (ibid) focused on their attitudes towards the private security sector, including private security suppliers and corporate security departments. The purpose of the study was to enhance strategies for collaborating with the private security sector effectively. Most respondents perceived both the police and the public to hold a negative opinion of private security. A small minority considered police officers view private security as essential partners, while around three in ten saw private security as tolerated, with over half acknowledging their occasional usefulness (ibid: 6-7).

Additionally, in Howell and Gill's research, a majority of police officers felt that private security officers lacked adequate training to be effective. Nearly 70% indicated that security officers do not serve as the eyes and ears of the police, although over 40% felt they should. Most police officers favoured private security assisting with private events, but some saw this role as administrative rather than policing.

Corporate security departments were viewed as important by 62% of respondents in aiding police work, while security officers were considered less significant by 36%. Nearly 80% opposed the idea of security officers acting as first responders for incidents on behalf of the police (Howell and Gill, ibid).

Over half the police officers in this research disagreed with the notion that collaborative efforts between the police and private security are necessary, citing the current constraints on police funding. Police officers generally showed little support for private security officers being seconded or given extra powers. Additionally, the concept of businesses providing funds to the police for addressing specific types of crime was not widely embraced among respondents.

According to Howell and Gill's research, it appears that there is a substantial amount of groundwork required in the UK to establish a more sophisticated and comprehensive strategy for collaboration between the police and private security firms. This process of transformation towards enhanced cooperation and

operational practices will necessitate active involvement and alignment from police officers.

The growth of the private security industry reflects the breakdown of community bonds that comes with rising inequality. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that, 'everyone is entitled to the right to life, liberty, and security of person,' and it prohibits the arbitrary deprivation of property. Governments have an obligation to actively pursue the fulfilment of these rights through progressive measures. Unless the British Government either increases dramatically the number of operational police officers, or alternatively develops a working strategy for cooperative plural policing with the state at its centre, then the British Criminal Justice State has failed its citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderson, J. (1979) *Policing freedom*, Plymouth; Macdonald and Evans.

Ariel, B, Bland, M. and Sutherland, A. (2017) 'Lowering the threshold of effective deterrence – Testing the effect of private security agents in public spaces on crime: A randomized controlled trial in a mass transit system', PLoS ONE 12 (12): e0187392. Online at, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0187392 accessed 3.2.2024.

Bayley, D.H. and Shearing, C.D. (1996) 'The Future of Policing' *Law & Society Review,* Vol. 30, No. 3: 585-606.

Berki, R.N. (1986) *Security and Society: Reflections on Law, Order and Politics,* London; Dent.

Burris, S., Drahos, P. and Shearing, C. (2005) 'Nodal Governance', *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy,* Volume 30.

Bittner, E. (1985) 'The Capacity to Use Force as the Core of the Police Role' in *Moral Issues in Police Work*, F. A. Elliston and M. Feldberg, (eds.) Savage, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, pp.15-26.

Byrne, D. (2013) 'Complex Realist and Configuration Approaches to Cases: A Radical Synthesis', in D. Byrne and C.C. Ragin, *Case-Based Methods*, pp. 101-111, London; Sage.

Carter, B. and Sealey, A. (2013) 'Reflexivity, Realism and the Process of Casing' in in D. Byrne and C.C. Ragin, *Case-Based Methods*, pp. 69-83, London; Sage.

Clarke, R.V.G. (1980) 'Situational Crime Prevention: Theory and Practice', *British Journal of Criminology,* Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 136-147.

Clarke, R.V.G. and Mayhew, W.P. (1980), *Designing Out Crime,* HMSO, London.

Clarke, R.V.G. (1995) 'Situational crime prevention' in M. Tonry and D. Farrington, (eds), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research 'Building a Safer Society'*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 91–150.

Cohen, S. (1981) 'Footprints in the Sand: A Further Report on Criminology and the Sociology of Deviance in Britain', in Fitzgerald, M., McLennan, G and Pawson, J. (eds.), *Crime and Society, Readings in*

History and Theory, pp. 220-247, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.

Cohen, S. (1985) *Visions of Social Control,* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Collier, D. (1993) 'The Comparative Method', in Ada W. Finifter, (ed.) *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II,* Washington, D.C. American Political Science Association.

Collier, D. (2011) 'Understanding Process Tracing', *Political Science and Politics,* 44, No. 4: 823-830.

Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (2008) *Basics of Qualitative Research,* London: Sage.

Crawford, A., Lister, S. and Wall, D. (2003) 'Great expectations: Contract community policing in New Earswick', Joseph Rowntree Foundation, University of Leeds.

Crawford, A. and Lister, S. (2004) *The extended policing family. Visible patrols in residential areas.* York; Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Crawford, A., Lister, S., Blackburn, S. and Burnett, J. (2005) *Plural policing. The mixed economy of visible patrols in England and Wales.* Bristol; Policy Press.

Crawford, A. (2006) 'Policing and security as 'club goods': the new enclosures', in J. Wood and B. Dupont (eds) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of*

Security, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, pp. 111-138.

Crawford, A. (2013) 'The Police, Policing and the Future of the "Extended Policing Family', in J. Brown (ed.) *The Future of Policing: Papers Prepared for the Stevens Independent Commission into the Future of Policing in England and Wales,* London: Routledge.

Dinwiddy, J. (1978) 'The Classical Economists and the Utilitarians', in E.K. Bramstead and K.J. Melhuish (eds.) *Western Liberalism: A history in documents from Locke to Croce*, pp. 12-25, London; Longman.

Durkheim, E. (1912) *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*, Oxford World Classics published 2008.

Dworkin, R. (2000) *Sovereign Virtue: The theory and practice of equality,* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Eckstein, H. (1975) 'Case Studies and Theory in Political Science', in Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby (eds.) *Handbook of Political Science*, Vol. 7, Reading Mass: Addison-Wesley (Quoted in George and Bennett (2005: 74-75).

Elman, C. (2009) 'Explanatory Typologies in Qualitative Analysis', in Byrne, D. and Ragin, C.C. (eds.) *Case-Based Methods*, London Sage, pp. 121-31.

Farrell, G., Tseloni, A., Mailley, J. and Tilley, N. (2011) 'The Crime Drop and the Security Thesis'.

Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 48(2), 147-175.

Felson, M. (2002) *Crime and Everyday Life*, London: Sage.

Flick, U. (2009) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2013) 'Case Study' in N.K Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Enquiry,* 4th. Edition, London; Sage, pp.169-203.

Foucault, M. (1982) 'The subject and power', in H.L. Dryfus and P. Rabinow (eds) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 208-226.

George, A. L. and Bennett, A. (2005) *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Gerring, J. (2007) *Case Study Research: Principles and Practice,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Quoted in Carter, B. and Sealey, A. (2013) 'Reflexivity, Realism and the Process of Casing' in in D. Byrne and C.C. Ragin, *Case-Based Methods*, pp. 69-83, London; Sage.

Giddens, A. 1987 *Social Theory and Modern Sociology,* Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Giddens, A. (1991a), *Modernity and Self Identity. Self and Society in the Late Modern Age,* Cambridge; Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991b) *The consequences of modernity,* Cambridge; Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1994) 'Living in a Post-Traditional Society', in U. Beck, A. Giddens and S. Lash, *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, pp. 56-109, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Giddens, A., Beck, U. and Lash, S. (1994) *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order,* Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press.

Glaser, B. G. (1965) 'The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis', *Social Problems,* 12: 436-45.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory,* New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Hall, S. and Scraton, P. (1981), 'Law, Class and Control', in Fitzgerald, M., McLennan, G. and Pawson, J. (eds.), *Crime and Society: Readings in History and Theory,* pp. 460-497, Kegan Paul, London.

Harper, D. (1998) 'Visual Sociology: Expanding Sociological Vision' *The American Sociologist,* Spring, pp. 54-70.

HMIC 024/2013 'Police forces are rising to the financial challenge so far; but further cuts to budgets create risks for some forces' Online at, http://www.hmic.gov.uk/news/releases-

2013/0242013-police-forces-are-rising-to-the-challenge-but-further-cuts-create-risks/ Accessed 29.10.13.

Howell, C. and Gill, M. (2017) 'Police Views on Private Security: A Security Research Initiative Report'. Online at https://perpetuityresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/2017-09-Police-Views-on-Private-Security.pdf accessed 6.2.24.

Johnson, L. (2006) 'Transnational Security Governance' in J. Wood and B. Dupont (eds) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security,* Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, pp. 33-51.

Johnson, L. and Shearing, C. (2003) *Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice,* London; Routledge.

Jones, T, and Lister, S. (2015) 'The Policing of Public Space: Recent Developments in Plural Policing in England and Wales', *European Journal of Policing Studies* 2(3) 245-266

Jones, T. and Newburn, T. (2006) *Plural Policing: A comparative perspective,* London; Sage.

Lippert, R.K. (2011) 'British Journal of Criminology', Vol. 51, 6: 1067-69 (A review of White, A. (2010) *The Politics of Private Security: Regulation, Reform and Re-legitimation,* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Lijphart, A. (1971) 'Comparative Politics and Comparative Method', *American Political Science Review,*

Vol. 65, No. 3: 682-693, (September, 1971) (Quoted in George and Bennett (2005: 74-75).

Loader, I. (1997) 'Policing and the Social: Questions of Symbolic Power', *The British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 48, No.1, pp. 1-18.

Loader, I. and Walker, N. (2001) 'Policing as a Public Good: Reconstituting the Connections between Policing and the State', *Theoretical Criminology*, Vol. 5, 1: 9-35.

Loader, I and Walker, N. (2004) 'State of denial? Rethinking the governance of security', *Punishment and Society* 6 (2): 221-8.

Loader, I. and Walker, N. (2006) 'Necessary virtues: the legitimate place of the state in the production of security' in J. Wood and B. Dupont (eds) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security,* Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, pp. 165-195.

Loader, I. and Walker, N. (2007) *Civilizing Security,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Loader, I. and White, A, (2017) 'How can we better align private security with the public interest? Towards a civilizing model of regulation', *Regulation and Governance,* John Wiley & Sons, vol. 11(2), pages 166-184, June.

Lofthouse, M. (1996) 'The Core Mandate of Policing', in C. Critcher and D. Waddington. (eds), *Policing Public*

Order: Theoretical and Practical Issues, Aldershot: Avebury.

Mahoney, J. and Terrie, P.L. (2013) 'The Proper Relationship of Comparative-Historical Analysis to Statistical Analysis: Subordination, Integration or Separation?', in D. Byrne and C.C. Ragin, *Case-Based Methods*, pp. 410-42, London; Sage.

Marks, M. (2004) 'Researching police transformation', *British Journal of Criminology* 44:866-88.

Marks, M. and Goldsmith, A. (2006) 'The state, the people and democratic policing: the case of South Africa', in J. Wood and B. Dupont (eds) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security,* Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, pp. 33-51.

McManus, M. (1995) *From Fate to Choice: Private Bobbies, Public Beats*. Wiltshire; Avebury.

McManus, M. (2024) *The Palatinate, The Peninsular and The Slum: The science of police in Victorian Durham,* Privately Published.

Mill, J.S. (1869) online at https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/The_Subjection_of_Women Accessed 5.2.2024.

Miller, D. (1999) *Principles of social justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Minford, P. (1987), 'The Role of the Social Services: A View from the New Right', in Loney, M., Bowcock,

R., Clarke, J., Cochrane, A., Graham, P. and Wilson, M., (eds.), *The State or the Market. Politics and Welfare in Contemporary Britain,* pp. 70-82, Sage, London.

Mishler, E.G. (1986) *Research Interviewing: Context and Narrative,* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Mjøset, L. (2013) 'The Contextualist Approach to Social Science Methodology', in D. Byrne and C.C. Ragin, *Case-Based Methods*, pp. 39-68, London; Sage.

Noaks, L. (2000) Private cops on the block: A review of the role of private security in residential communities, *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy,* 10:2, 143-161,

Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming The Public Sector*, New York: Addison-Westley.

Ragin, C. and Becker, H.S. (eds) (1992), *What is a Case?: Exploring the Foundations of Social Enquiry.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Radzinowicz, L. (1956), *A History of English Criminal Law and its Administration from 1750,* Vols. 2 and 3, Stevens, London.

Rawls, J. (1971) *A theory of justice,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richie, J. and Lewis, J. (eds) (2003) *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students*, London; Sage.

Roshier, R. (1989) *Controlling Crime: The Classical Perspective in Criminology*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Sharp, D. and Wilson, D. (2000) 'Household Security Private Policing and Vigilantism in Doncaster', *The Howard Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 2: 113-131.

Shearing, C. (2006) 'Reflections on the refusal to acknowledge private governments' in J. Wood and B. Dupont (eds) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security,* Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-32.

Shearing, C. and Stenning, P. (1987) (eds) *Private Policing*, Newbury Park, CA; Sage Publications.

Snow, D.A., Morrill, C. and Anderson, L. (2003) 'Elaborating analytic ethnography: Linking fieldwork and theory', *Ethnography*, 4: 181-200.

Spitzer, S. (1981) 'The Political Economy of Policing', in Greenburg, D.F. (ed.) *Police and Capitalism,* Mayfield, London.

Spitzer, S. (1995), 'Security and Control in Capitalist Societies: The Fetishism of Security and the Secret Thereof', in R.V. Ericson, *Crime and the Media.*

Spitzer, S. and Scull, A. (1977) 'Privatization and Capitalist Development: The Case of the Private Police' in *Social Problems*, 25:18-29.

Spitzer, S. (1983), 'The Rationalization of Crime Control in Capitalist Society', in Cohen, S. and Scull, A.T. (eds.), *Political Control and the State: Historical and Comparative Essays,* pp. 312-333, Robertson, Oxford.

Suttles, G.D. (1972) *The Social Construction of Communities,* Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Young, J. (1981) 'Thinking Seriously About Crime: Some Methods of Criminology', in Fitzgerald, M. McLennan, G. and Pawson, J., (eds.), *Crime and Society. Readings in History and Theory,* pp. 248-309, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Vallar, C. (2022) 'The limited role of private security in the public space', PACTESUR, online at https://efus.eu/topics/public-spaces/the-limited-role-of-private-security-in-the-public-space/ Accessed 10.2.24.

Valverde, (2001) 'Governing security, governing through security' in R. Daniels, P. Maclam and K. Roach (eds) *The security of freedom: Essays on Canada's anti-terrorism bill,* Toronto; University of Toronto Press, pp. 83-92.

Wakefield, A. (2003) *Selling Security. The private policing of public space.* Cullompton, Devon; Willan.

Waldron, J. (1993) *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers 1981-1991.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, A. (2010) *The Politics of Private Security: Regulation, Reform and Re-legitimation,* Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

White, A. (2012) 'The New Political Economy of Private Security', *Theoretical Criminology*, 16: 85-101.

Wilson, A. (1993) 'Towards an Integration of Content Analysis and Discourse Analysis: The Automatic Linkage of Key Relations in Text' in Volume 3 of *Unit for Computer Research on the English Language* technical papers, pp. 1-11.

Wilson, J.Q. (1983) *Crime and Public Policy*, California, ICS Press.

Wood, J. (2006) 'Research and innovation in the field of security: a nodal governance view', in Wood, J. and Dupont, B. (eds) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press, pp. 217- 240.

Wood, J. and Dupont, B. (eds) (2006) *Democracy, Society and the Governance of Security*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Wood, J. and Shearing, C. (2007) *Imagining Security*, Cullompton: Willan.

Young, I. (1990) *Justice and the politics of difference,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zedner, L. (2003a) 'The Concept of Security: An Agenda for Comparative Analysis', *Legal Studies*, 23(1):153-176.

Zedner, L. (2003b) 'Too Much Security?' *International Journal of the Sociology of Law,* 31, 3:155-184.

Zedner, L. (2007) 'Pre-crime and post-criminology?' *Theoretical Criminology*, 11 (2): 261-81.

Zedner, L. (2009) *Security,* Oxfordshire; Routledge.

Index

A

a complex of virtues, 28
ability to explain or predict an outcome in each case., 9
academic stalemate must not be allowed to rest, 6
address theoretical and methodological limitations, 3
analysis of six case studies, 1
Ariel, Bland and Sutherland, 3, 59
attitudes towards the private security sector, 62

B

Baumeister and Tice, 35
Berki, 17, 33
Birk, 26
Birki, 23
Bittner, 30
British Criminal Justice State has failed, 64
Broduer, 35
Buckner, 35
Burris, Drahos, 5
Byrne, 35

C

case study design, 8
Case Study Five, 51
Case Study Four, 48
Case Study One, 41
Case Study Six, 53
Case Study Three, 45
Case study Two, 43
causal relationship, 10
Clarke, 38
Cohen, 27
collective good, 1
Collier, 9
concluding measurement, 56
contextual framework of explanatory typologies, 56
coordination of the state at its centre, 58
Crawford, 23
crime intelligence, 31
cultural identification, 32

D

De-centred governance theorists, 5
define 'equitable', 7
defined private security patrol, 7
deliberation' in state-centred provision, 31
democratic accountability, 31
dependent variable, 9
Doncaster, South Yorkshire, 44

E

Elman, 10
equitable provision, 1
Ericson and Haggerty, 59
existence of a causal relationship, 58
explanatory typologies, 10

F

Felson, 20
Flint,, 35
fortifying collective security, 32
four dimensions of policing a, 29
freedom and social inclusion, 33

G

George and Bennett, 9
Giddens, 24, 27
Giddens, Beck and Lash, 27
Guerette, and Bowers, 35

H

historic re-ordering, 2
how pluralistic security provision should be configured for the future, 2
Howell and Gill, 62

I

Idealism, 59

J

Jacobson and Saville, 53
Johnson and Shearing, 2003, 5
Jones, and Lister, 2

L

Lau and Ridge, 35
legitimate, coercive, non-negotiable force, 29
limited force, 29
Loader, 33
Loader and Mulcahy, 32
Loader and Walker, 5, 28

M

Marks and Goldsmith, 5
McManus, 2, 8
McManus,, 27

Mill,, 38
mutual concern for others, 12

N

Neo-liberal security as paradoxical, 17
neo-liberal security as paradoxical and state policing as a public good, 12
neo-liberal thinking, 11
Noakes, 48
Noaks, 8
nodal network of providers, 6
non-state providers, 2

O

O'Malley, 4, 35, 37
ordinal measurement, 10
outskirts of London, 48

P

private security patrol in public residential areas of the United Kingdom, 1
problem of social justice and democracy in security provision, 5
profoundly contradictory on how security should be governed, 5
public good, 28
public space and private space, 8

R

reduce victims and deter offenders, 3
restraint of freedom, 34

S

security as a 'collective good', 5
Security as a 'thick' public good, 13
security governance studies, 2
security is configured, 4
Sharp and Wilson, 43
Sharpe and Wilson, 8
Shearing, 5
social interaction, 12
Southwark, London, 53
Stenson and Edwards, 4
Suttles, 24

T

taxing of the population, 32
the breakdown of community bonds, 64
the eight opposing dimensions of collective security, 34
THE EIGHT OPPOSING DIMENSIONS OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY DEFINED, 36
The European Forum for Urban Security, 60
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 64
thick' public good, 31

three security-related intentions, 25
trust,, 12

U

unlikely to provide 'equitable security, 11
unlikely to provide equitable security, 2

V

Vallar, 61
values within the state, 33

W

Waldron, 14
Wood, 3
Wood and Dupont, 3
Wood and Shearing, 5

Z

Zedner, 3, 5, 6, 15, 26, 33, 37

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Michael McManus was born in Durham City, UK in 1946. He is a Retired Airman, Royal Navy (1964-1971); Retired Police Officer, Durham Constabulary (1971-1999); Retired Part-time Teacher, University of Durham (1999-2015). He is married to Annette, for 55 years and they live in Durham City. He was awarded a BA (Hons) from Newcastle Polytechnic (now the University of Northumbria) and a PhD from the University of Durham. He is now a Leisure Painter, Leisure Writer, Leisure Musician and Leisure Poet.